

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-65 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 17, 18, 32, 33, 37, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami, U.S. Patent No. 4,815,132 ("Minami"), in view of Weinstein et al. IEEE SAC-1 No. 6, ("Weinstein"). The Examiner rejects claims 3, 9, 19, 21, 25, 36 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Weinstein and further in view of Coker et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,581,758 ("Coker"). Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-17, 32, and 37, and cancel claim 4. Applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank Examiner Swerdlow for his allowance of claims 47-65. Claims 4, 6-8, 10-16, 22-24, 26-29, 34, 35, 39, 40, and 42 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have elected to rewrite claims 4, 6-8, and 10-16 in independent form to put them in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections – U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejects claims 17, 18, 32, 33, 37, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Weinstein, and claims 19, 21, 25, 36 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Weinstein and further in view of Coker. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Amended claim 17 recites *estimating, using voice samples captured in the approximate timeframe of the first time period, an explicit relative temporal delay between the first and second sound field signals and transmitting to a remote conferencing point, in packet format, both the encoded block of combined voice samples and a stereo decoding parameter including the estimated relative temporal delay*. Claims 32, and 37 recite similar limitations.


Applicants have amended claims 17, 32, and 37 to clarify that the estimating is of an *explicit* relative temporal delay and that the stereo decoding parameter *includes* the explicit relative temporal delay. Applicants agree with the Examiner in that Minami "fails to disclose or fairly suggest ... [including] explicit parameter(s)" within its transfer function. Final Office Action, 3/8/2005, page 10. Neither Weinstein nor Coker cure this deficiency. Thus, from the Examiner's remarks, it appears that the Examiner and Applicants are in substantial

agreement that the claims as amended are novel and unobvious since they clearly exclude the ability of Minami to estimate and include a non-explicit delay in its transfer function. Accordingly, Minami does not anticipate claim 17, or claims 32, and 37, or their corresponding dependent claims. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed to issue.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-46 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen S. Ford  
Reg. No. 35,139

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
503-222-3613  
Customer No. 20575